



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,462	01/22/2002	Michelangelo Scalone	20826	5548

151 7590 03/28/2003

HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT
340 KINGSLAND STREET
NUTLEY, NJ 07110

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, REBECCA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/054,462

Applicant(s)

SCALONE ET AL.

Examiner

Rebecca L Anderson

Art Unit

1626

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-31 drawn to the process for the preparation of the compound of the formula (I) classified in various subclasses of classes 548 and 549.
- II. Claim 32 drawn to the process for the preparation of 1-(9H-carbazol-4-yloxy)-3-[[2-(2-methoxyphenoxy)ethyl]amino]-2-propanol classified in class 548 subclass 444.
- III. Claim 33 drawn to the compound (IIa) classified in various subclasses in class 548 subclass.

The above groups are identified as general areas. Accordingly, as groups they are independent or distinct as inventions I and II are distinct processes comprising different reactants and/or reaction conditions and/or products. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as the process as found on page 1924 of Iwasaki et al. Inventions III and I or II are separate statutory classes of invention, i.e. Invention III is a product and inventions I and II are processes. The inventions are independent and distinct because the

Art Unit: 1626

processes of inventions I and II can utilize other compounds as intermediates in instantly claimed processes and separate search considerations are involved.

The above groups themselves are inclusive of patentably distinct subject matter. Accordingly, along with the election of one of the above groups the following action is also taken.

Claims 1, 32 and 33 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising for example: (1) the process for the preparation of 9-benzenesulfonyl-9H-carbazol-4-ol, example 8, page 28, etc. (2) the process for the preparation of 1-(9H-carbazol-4-yloxy)-3-[[2-(2-methoxyphenoxy)ethyl]amino]-2-propanol, example 6, etc. 3) the compound of example 9, page 28, benzoic acid 1-(1-benzenesulfonyl-1H-indole-2-yl)-allyl ester, 4) the compound of example 5, page 26, acetic acid 1-(1-benzenesulfonyl-1H-indol-2-yl)-allyl ester, etc. **Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.**

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1626

Upon the election of a single disclosed species, a generic concept inclusive of the elected species will be identified by the Examiner for examination along with the elected species.

The following is a recitation of M.P.E.P. 821.04, Rejoinder:

Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02(c) and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Where the application as originally filed discloses the product and the process for making and/or using the product, and only claims directed to the product are presented for examination, when a product claim is found allowable, applicant may present claims directed to the process of making and/or using the patentable product by way of amendment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121. In view of the rejoinder procedure, and in order to expedite prosecution, applicants are encouraged to present such process claims, preferably as dependent claims, in the application at an early stage of prosecution. Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116. Process claims which do not depend from or otherwise include the limitations of the patentable product will be withdrawn from consideration, via an election by original presentation (see MPEP § 821.03). Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed product claim and which meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112 may be entered.

Where product and process claims are presented in a single application and that application qualifies under the transitional restriction practice pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b), applicant may either: (A) elect the invention to be searched and examined and pay the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(s) and have the additional inventions searched and examined under 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2); or (B) elect the invention to be searched and examined and not pay the additional fee (37 CFR 1.129(b)(3)). Where no additional fee is paid, if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims which either depend from or include all the

Art Unit: 1626

limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. If applicant chooses to pay the fees to have the additional inventions searched and examined pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2) even if the product is found allowable, applicant would not be entitled to a refund of the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) by arguing that the process claims could have been rejoined. 37 CFR 1.26(a) states that "[T]he Commissioner may refund any fee paid by mistake or in excess of that required. A change of purpose after the payment of a fee...will not entitle a party to a refund of such fee..." In this case, the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) were not paid by mistake nor paid in excess, therefore, applicant would not be entitled to a refund. In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action. Form paragraphs 8.42 through 8.44 should be used to notify applicant of the rejoinder of process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim.

Therefore, in accordance with M.P.EP 821.04 and *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims with process claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until, such time, a restriction between product claims and process claims is deemed proper. Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to maintain either dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1626

A telephone call was made to Herbert Goodman on 6 March 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rebecca L. Anderson whose telephone number is (703) 605-1157. Mrs. Anderson can normally be reached Monday through Friday 7:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph McKane, can be reached at (703) 308-4537.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone numbers are (703) 308-1235 and (703) 308-0196.

A facsimile center has been established. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45AM to 4:45PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machine are (703) 308-4242, (703) 305-3592, and (703) 305-3014.



Rebecca Anderson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1600



Joseph McKane
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1600